UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/599,397	09/27/2006	Dag Baekkedal	RR-637 PCT/US	8165
20427 RODMAN ROI	7590 03/17/200 DMAN	EXAMINER		
10 STEWART PLACE SUITE 2CE WHITE PLAINS, NY 10603			MCGUTHRY BANKS, TIMA MICHELE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1793	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/17/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/599,397	BAEKKEDAL ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	TIMA M. MCGUTHRY-BANKS	1793			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 Ja 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL . 2b) ☐ This 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowar closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro				
Disposition of Claims					
4) Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn f 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 7-17 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or Application Papers	from consideration.				
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ acce Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti 11) ☑ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex-	epted or b) objected to by the Idrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See ion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 					
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6/27/07,1/08/07.	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

Claims 1, 2, 6-8, 10, 12 and 15-17 are as originally filed and Claims 3-5, 9, 11, 13 and 14 are currently amended.

Election/Restrictions

Claims 1-7 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected method, there being no allowable generic or linking claim.

Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 1/14/2009.

Applicant's election with traverse of Claims 8-17 in the reply filed on 1/14/2009 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that both groups of claims relate to metal melting technology, and a search of the elected apparatus claims of Group II would also appear to include a search for the non-elected method of Claims of Group I. This is not found persuasive because the apparatus claims of Group II would also related to non-metal melting technology, such as for glass. Additionally, the method claims of Group I do not require the same structural limitations (e.g. plurality of apertures and flow straightening means) as do the apparatus claims.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Oath/Declaration

The oath or declaration is defective. A new oath or declaration in compliance with 37 CFR 1.67(a) identifying this application by application number and filing date is required. See MPEP §§ 602.01 and 602.02.

The oath or declaration is defective because:

It does not identify the mailing address of each inventor. A mailing address is an address at which an inventor customarily receives his or her mail and may be either a home or business address. The mailing address should include the ZIP Code designation. The mailing address may be provided in an application data sheet or a supplemental oath or declaration. See 37 CFR 1.63(c) and 37 CFR 1.76.

It does not identify the city and either state or foreign country of residence of each inventor. The residence information may be provided on either an application data sheet or supplemental oath or declaration.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 7-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph as being indefinite in that the flow inducing means and the flow straightening means impacts the flow of molten metal through the device. The claim does not set forth how the molten metal, which is claimed to be in the body portion of the device and below the upper portion, could be anywhere else in the device.

Art Unit: 1793

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite in that it fails to point out what is included or excluded by the claim language. This claim is an omnibus type claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* v. *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

- 1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
- 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
- 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
- 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Art Unit: 1793

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marx (US 1,993,972).

Marx teaches a refining cupola furnace. Fig 1 teaches a lower portion, an upper portion, and a body portion. The plurality of apertures is taught by tuyeres Z (page 1, column 2, lines 35-37). The limitation including and after "the device arranged, in use" is intended use. Language in the claim that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation, for example statements of intended use or field of use. See MPEP § 2106. Regarding the introduction means, Marx teaches that shaft j accommodates lumpy material (lines 14 and 15). The furnace is charged with pieced material (page 2, column 1, lines 1 and 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the furnace of Marx would include an introduction means since the material is melted. The flow inducing means is taught by the circulating heat that agitates the bath (page 1, column 1, lines 41-43). The flow straightening means for encouraging axial flow is taught by the burners c as shown in Fig 2 and alternatively, with the vertical flow of material

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 8-16 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and to overcome the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding Claims 8 and 13-16, Marx does not teach or suggest an impellor. The agitation is Art Unit: 1793

taught by the use burners. Regarding Claims 9 and 10, Marx does not disclose or suggest baffles either in the furnace shaft or with the agitation means.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to TIMA M. MCGUTHRY-BANKS whose telephone number is (571)272-2744. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on (571) 272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/T. M. M./ Examiner, Art Unit 1793 9 March 2009

> /George Wyszomierski/ Primary Examiner Art Unit 1793